

Amendments to the Drawings:

The drawing sheets attached in connection with the above-identified application containing Figs. 1-6 are being presented as replacement sheets to be substituted for the previously submitted drawing sheets containing Figs. 1-6. The drawing Figs. 1-5 have been amended.

The specific changes which have been made to Figs. 1-5 are that Figs. 1-5 have been labeled with the legend "Prior Art".

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1, 3-19, and 22-25 are amended. Claims 20-21 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 26-27 are added.

Thus, claims 1-19 and 22-27 are pending in the application. A detailed listing of all claims that are in the application, is presented, with appropriately defined status identifiers.

Allowable Subject Matter:

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the indication that claims 3-6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, and 22-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the previous base claim 1, and has been further amended for clarity. Therefore, independent claim 3, as amended, is believed to be allowable. Because they depend from independent claim 3, dependent claims 4-5, 7-8, 18-19, and 23-24 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 3 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the previous base claim 1, and has been further amended for clarity. Therefore, independent claim 6, as amended, is believed to be allowable. Because they depend from independent claim 6, dependent claims 22 and 25 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 6 is believed to be allowable.

Applicant expresses further appreciation to the Examiner for the indication that claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and has been further amended for clarity. Therefore, independent claim 15, as amended, is believed to be allowable.

Drawings:

The Examiner stated that figures 1-5 should be designated by a legend such as “Prior Art” because only that which is old is illustrated.

Figures 1-5 have been designated with the legend “Prior Art” according to the Examiner’s suggestion. Thus, the figures are believed to be in compliance with MPEP § 608.02(g).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claims 7, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 20-21 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. With respect to claims 7, 11, 14, 15, and 17, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 7 and 17, the Examiner stated that claim 17 is identical to claim 7 and that they both depend from claim 3. Claim 17 has now been amended to depend from claim 16, rather than from claim 3. Thus, claims 7 and 17 are believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 11 and 14 have been amended to cancel the portions noted by the Examiner in the rejection. Therefore, claims 11 and 14, as amended, are believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

With respect to independent claim 15, the Examiner stated that “it is not clear if ‘a clock signal’ on lines 9 and 20 is the same as ‘a clock signal’ already set forth on line 5”. Independent claim 15 has been amended to change “a clock signal” on previous line 9 to “a corresponding clock signal”. Independent claim 15 has also been amended to change “a clock signal” on previous line 20 to “the clock signal corresponding to the second logic circuit”. Therefore, independent claim 15, as amended, is believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Widener (U.S. Patent No. 4,777,388).

With respect to claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, and 14, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a current supply control circuit for controlling an amount of current supplied to a differential circuit, comprising:

“a bypass path for bypassing current around said differential circuit;
switching means, interposed in said bypath pass, for opening/closing said bypass path in accordance with a signal level of a clock signal; and
control means for controlling the amount of current supplied to said differential circuit in accordance with the signal level of the clock signal;
said bypass path and said control means configured such that the amount of current supplied to said differential circuit is reduced in a case where said switching means closes said bypass path to cause current to flow through said bypass path.” (Emphasis Added).

A current supply control circuit including the above-quoted features has at least the advantages that: (i) a bypass path allows for bypassing current around a differential circuit; (ii) a switching means is interposed in the bypath pass and allows for opening/closing the bypass path in accordance with a signal level of a clock signal; (iii) a control means allows for controlling an amount of current supplied to the differential circuit in accordance with the signal level of the clock signal; and (iv) the bypass path and the control means are configured such that the amount of current supplied to the differential circuit is reduced in a case where the switching means closes the bypass path to cause current to flow through the bypass path. (See Applicant’s Specification, paragraphs [0036], [0047], [0049], and [0060]).

Widener neither discloses nor suggests a current supply control circuit including the above-quoted features in which a bypass path and a control means are configured such that an

amount of current supplied to a differential circuit is reduced in a case where a switching means closes the bypass path to cause current to flow through the bypass path. (Widener; FIG. 2). The Examiner points to the input amplifier 16 in FIG. 2 of Widener as disclosing a differential circuit, the conducting path of 28 as disclosing a bypass path, the buffer amplifier 28 as disclosing a switching means, and the transistor (hereinafter T1) in block 24 directly connected to transistor 42 as disclosing a control means. (Office Action; page 3). However, in the system of Widener, in a case where the buffer amplifier 28 closes the path of 28 to cause current to flow through the path of 28, the amount of current supplied to the input amplifier 16 is actually increased. (Widener; FIG. 2). This is because, in a case where the buffer amplifier 28 of Widener closes the path of 28 to cause current to flow through the path of 28, the transistor T1 is turned from “off” to “on”, which causes the input amplifier 16 to conduct current. (Widener; column 2, lines 30-44; FIG. 2). In contrast, the present claim 1 recites “said bypass path and said control means configured such that the amount of current supplied to said differential circuit is reduced in a case where said switching means closes said bypass path to cause current to flow through said bypass path.” (Emphasis Added). As a consequence, Widener neither discloses nor suggests the bypass path and control means of the present independent claim 1.

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Widener reference and, hence, is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 9 recites a latch circuit with features similar to features of a current supply control circuit of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent claim 12 recites a selector circuit with features similar to features of a current supply control circuit of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 10, 2007

By Justin M. Sobaje

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (213) 972-4596
Facsimile: (213) 486-0065

Justin M. Sobaje
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,252